arXiv:1411.4984v1 [math.GM] 18 Nov 2014

On some properties of seminormed fuzzy integrals

Michał Boczek [1], Marek Kaluszka [2]

Institute of Mathematics, Lodz University of Technology, 90-924 Lodz, Poland

Abstract

We give solutions to Problems 2.21, 2.31 and 2.32, which were posed Borzová-Molnárová, Halčinová and Hutník in [*The smallest semicopula-based universal integrals I: properties and characterizations,* Fuzzy Sets and Systems (2014), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fss. 2014.09.0232014].

Keywords: Sugeno integral; Seminorm; Capacity; Monotone measure, Semicopula; Fuzzy integrals.

1 Introduction

Let $(X, \mathcal{A})$ be a measurable space, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a σ-algebra of subsets of a non-empty set X, and let $\mathcal{S}$ be the family of all measurable spaces. The class of all $\mathcal{A}$-measurable functions $f\colon X \to [0,1]$ is denoted by $\mathcal{F}_{(X,\mathcal{A})}$. A *capacity* on $\mathcal{A}$ is a non-decreasing set function $\mu\colon \mathcal{A} \to [0,1]$ with $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\mu(X) = 1$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_{(X,\mathcal{A})}$ the class of all capacities on $\mathcal{A}$.

Suppose that $\mathrm{S}\colon [0,1]^2 \to [0,1]$ is a semicopula (also called a *t-seminorm*), i.e., a non-decreasing function in both coordinates with the neutral element equal to 1. It is clear that $\mathrm{S}(x,y) \leqslant x \wedge y$ and $\mathrm{S}(x,0) = 0 = \mathrm{S}(0,x)$ for all $x, y \in [0,1]$, where $x \wedge y = \min(x,y)$ (see [1, 2, 5]). We denote the class of all semicopulas by $\mathfrak{S}$.

There are three important examples of semicopulas: M, Π and S_L, where $\mathrm{M}(a,b) = a \wedge b$, $\Pi(a,b) = ab$ and $\mathrm{S}_L(a,b) = (a+b-1) \vee 0$; S_L is called the *Łukasiewicz t-norm* [7]. Hereafter, $a \vee b = \max(a,b)$. A function $\mathrm{S}^*\colon [0,1]^2 \to [0,1]$ is called a *t-coseminorm* if $\mathrm{S}^*(x,y) = 1 - \mathrm{S}(1-x, 1-y)$ for some semicopula S.

A generalized Sugeno integral is defined by

$$\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}(\mu, f) := \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t, \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big)\Big),$$

where $\{f \geqslant t\} = \{x \in X\colon f(x) \geqslant t\}$, $(X, \mathcal{A}) \in \mathcal{S}$ and $(\mu, f) \in \mathcal{M}_{(X,\mathcal{A})} \times \mathcal{F}_{(X,\mathcal{A})}$. In the literature the functional $\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}$ is also called *seminormed fuzzy integral* [3, 6, 9]. Replacing semicopula S with M, we get the *Sugeno integral* [11]. Moreover, if $\mathrm{S} = \Pi$, then $\mathbf{I}_{\Pi}$ is called the *Shilkret integral* [10].

[1]Corresponding author. E-mail adress: 800401@edu.p.lodz.pl;

[2]E-mail adress: kaluszka@p.lodz.pl; tel.: +48 42 6313859; fax.: +48 42 6363114.

The paper is devoted to the solution of Problems 2.21, 2.31 and 2.32, which were posed by Borzowá-Molnárová, Halčinová and Hutník [4] (see also [8]). In Section 2 we present our main results and some related results. In the next section we give conditions equivalent to comonotone $\circ$-additivity of the generalized Sugeno integral $\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}$.

2 Weak subadditivity of integral $\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}$

In this section we present necessary and sufficient conditions for validity of the inequality

$$\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}\big(\mu, f + a\big) \leqslant \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}\big(\mu, f\big) + a, \tag{1}$$

where $f + a \in [0, 1]$. Borzowá-Molnárová *et al.* [4] proposed a sufficient condition only, which turns out to be too restrictive.

Theorem 2.1. *The inequality* (1) *is satisfied for all* $a \in [0, 1]$ *and* $(\mu, f) \in \mathcal{M}_{(X,\mathcal{A})} \times \mathcal{F}_{(X,\mathcal{A})}$ *such that* $f + a \in [0, 1]$ *iff*

$$\mathrm{S}(c + a, b) \leqslant \mathrm{S}(c, b) + a \tag{2}$$

for all $a, b, c \in [0, 1]$ *such that* $a + c \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. We first prove that the inequality (1) holds true under the assumption (2). The inequality can be rewritten as follows

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t, \mu\big(\{f + a \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) \leqslant \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t, \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) + a. \tag{3}$$

The inequality (3) is obvious for $a \in \{0, 1\}$, so we assume that $a \in (0, 1)$. Observe that $\mu\big(\{f + a \geqslant t\}\big) = 1$ for $t \in [0, a]$. Since $\mathrm{S}(a, 1) = a$ for all a, the left-hand side of (3) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t, \mu\big(\{f + a \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) &= \max\Big[\sup_{t\in[0,a]} \mathrm{S}(t, 1), \sup_{t\in(a,1]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t, \mu\big(\{f + a \geqslant t\}\big)\Big)\Big] \\ &= a \vee \sup_{t\in(0,1-a]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t + a, \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) \\ &= \sup_{t\in[0,1-a]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t + a, \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big)\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

From (3) and (4) we get

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1-a]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t + a, \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) \leqslant \sup_{t\in[0,1-a]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t, \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) + a, \tag{5}$$

because $\{f \geqslant t\} = \emptyset$ for $t > a$ and $\mathrm{S}(b,0) = 0$ for all b. Let $f(x) = cx$, $x \in [0,1]$, and $\mu(A) = b$ for all $A \notin \{\emptyset, X\}$, where $0 < b < 1$, $0 < c \leqslant 1 - a$. Thus

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1-a]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t + a, \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) = a \vee \big(\mathrm{S}(c + a, b)\big),$$
$$\sup_{t\in[0,1-a]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t, \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) + a = \mathrm{S}(c,b) + a = a \vee \big(\mathrm{S}(c,b) + a\big).$$

Combining this with (5) we obtain

$$a \vee \big(\mathrm{S}(c + a, b)\big) \leqslant a \vee \big(\mathrm{S}(c,b) + a\big) \tag{6}$$

for all $(a,b,c) \in \mathrm{C}$, as $\mathrm{C} = \{(a,b,c)\colon 0 < a < 1,\ 0 < b < 1,\ 0 < c \leqslant 1 - a\}$.

It is obvious that $x \vee y \leqslant x \vee z$ implies $(y \leqslant z)$ or $(x \geqslant y > z)$ for all x, y, z, so from (6) it follows that

$$\big(\mathrm{S}(c + a, b) \leqslant \mathrm{S}(c,b) + a\big) \quad \text{or} \quad \big(a \geqslant \mathrm{S}(c + a, b) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{S}(c + a, b) > \mathrm{S}(c,b) + a\big). \tag{7}$$

Hence we get

$$\mathrm{S}(c + a, b) \leqslant \mathrm{S}(c,b) + a, \tag{8}$$

for all $a, b, c \in \mathrm{C}$, as the second sentence in (7) leads to a contradiction. Let us notice that (8) also holds for $a = 0$, $a = 1$ and $c = 0$, as well as $b = 0$, $b = 1$. Now we show that if $\mathrm{S}(c + a, b) \leqslant \mathrm{S}(c,b) + a$, then inequality (1) is satisfied for all $(\mu, f) \in \mathcal{M}_{(X,\mathcal{A})} \times \mathcal{F}_{(X,\mathcal{A})}$ such that $f + a \in [0,1]$. Applying (2) we obtain

$$\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}(\mu, f + a) = \sup_{t\in[0,1-a]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t + a, \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) \leqslant \sup_{t\in[0,1-a]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t, \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) + a = \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}(\mu, f) + a.$$

The proof is complete. □

Remark 2.1. From (2) it follows that $\mathrm{S}_L(x,y) \leqslant \mathrm{S}(x,y)$ for all $x, y \in [0,1]$; to see this put $c + a = 1$ in (2).

We show that the sufficient condition guaranteeing validity of (1) (see the inequality (3) in Borzowá-Molnárová *et al.* [4]) is also necessary but for a slightly different problem (see Corollary 2.1 (a) below).

Theorem 2.2. *The inequality*

$$\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}_1}\big(\mu, (f + a)\mathbb{1}_A\big) \leqslant \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}_2}\big(\mu, f\mathbb{1}_A\big) + \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}_3}\big(\mu, a\mathbb{1}_A\big) \tag{9}$$

holds for all $a \in [0,1]$, $\mathrm{S}_i \in \mathfrak{S}$, $A \in \mathcal{A}$, *and* $(\mu, f) \in \mathcal{M}_{(X,\mathcal{A})} \times \mathcal{F}_{(X,\mathcal{A})}$ *such that* $f + a \in [0,1]$ *iff the inequality*

$$\mathrm{S}_1(x + y, z) \leqslant \mathrm{S}_2(x,z) + \mathrm{S}_3(y,z) \tag{10}$$

is satisfied for all $x, y, z \in [0,1]$ *such that* $x + y \in [0,1]$.

Proof. We claim that (9) follows from (10). Indeed

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathrm{S}_1\Big(t, \mu\big(A\cap\{f+a\geqslant t\}\big)\Big) &= \sup_{t\in[0,a]} \mathrm{S}_1\big(t,\mu(A)\big) \vee \sup_{t\in(a,1]} \mathrm{S}_1\Big(t, \mu\big(A\cap\{f+a\geqslant t\}\big)\Big)\\ &= \mathrm{S}_1\big(a,\mu(A)\big) \vee \sup_{t\in(0,1-a]} \mathrm{S}_1\Big(t+a, \mu\big(\{f\geqslant t\}\big)\Big)\\ &= \sup_{t\in[0,1-a]} \mathrm{S}_1\Big(t+a, \mu\big(\{f\geqslant t\}\big)\Big)\\ &\leqslant \sup_{t\in[0,1-a]} \Big(\mathrm{S}_2\Big(t, \mu\big(A\cap\{f\geqslant t\}\big)\Big) + \mathrm{S}_3\Big(a, \mu\big(A\cap\{f\geqslant t\}\big)\Big)\Big)\\ &\leqslant \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}_2}\big(\mu, f\mathbb{1}_A\big) + \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}_3}\big(\mu, a\mathbb{1}_A\big).\end{aligned}$$

Putting $f = b\mathbb{1}_A \in [0,1]$ in (9), we obtain (10), which completes the proof. □

Applying Theorem 2.2 to $\mathrm{S}_1 = \mathrm{S}_2$ and $\mathrm{S}_3 = \mathrm{S}$, $\mathrm{S}_3 = \wedge$ or $\mathrm{S}_3 = \Pi$ we get

Corollary 2.1. *(a)* $\mathrm{S}(x+y,z) \leqslant \mathrm{S}(x,z) + \mathrm{S}(y,z)$ *for all* x,y,z *iff for all* a, f, A, μ

$$\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}\big(\mu, (f+a)\mathbb{1}_A\big) \leqslant \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}\big(\mu, f\mathbb{1}_A\big) + \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}\big(\mu, a\mathbb{1}_A\big),$$

(b) $\mathrm{S}(x+y,z) \leqslant \mathrm{S}(x,z) + (y\wedge z)$ *for all* x,y,z *iff for all* a, f, A, μ

$$\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}\big(\mu, (f+a)\mathbb{1}_A\big) \leqslant \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}\big(\mu, f\mathbb{1}_A\big) + \big(a\wedge\mu(A)\big),$$

(c) $\mathrm{S}(x+y,z) \leqslant \mathrm{S}(x,z) + yz$ *for all* x,y,z *iff for all* a, f, A, μ

$$\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}\big(\mu, (f+a)\mathbb{1}_A\big) \leqslant \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}\big(\mu, f\mathbb{1}_A\big) + a\mu(A).$$

3 Some other properties of integral $\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}$

In this section, the solution to Problems 2.31 and 2.32 of Borzová-Molnárová, Halčinová and Hutník [4] is provided. We say that $f, g\colon X \to [0,1]$ are *comonotone* on $A \in \mathcal{F}$, if $\big(f(x)-f(y)\big)\big(g(x)-g(y)\big) \geqslant 0$ for all $x, y \in A$. Clearly, if f and g are comonotone on A, then for any real number t either $\{f\geqslant t\} \subset \{g\geqslant t\}$ or $\{g\geqslant t\} \subset \{f\geqslant t\}$.

Problem 1 (Problem 2.31)**.** *Let* $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(X,\mathcal{A})}$ *and* $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_{(X,\mathcal{A})}$ *be comonotone functions. Characterize all the semicopulas* S *for which*

$$\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}(\mu, f\vee g) = \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}(\mu, f) \vee \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}(\mu, g). \tag{11}$$

Theorem 3.1. *The equality* (11) *holds for any semicopula* $\mathrm{S} \in \mathfrak{S}$.

Proof. Since f, g are comonotone, $\{f \geqslant t\} \subset \{g \geqslant t\}$ or $\{g \geqslant t\} \subset \{f \geqslant t\}$ for all t. Hence $\mu\big(\{f \vee g \geqslant t\}\big) = \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big) \vee \mu\big(\{g \geqslant t\}\big)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}\big(\mu, f \vee g\big) &= \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t, \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big) \vee \mu\big(\{g \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) \\
&= \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \Big\{\mathrm{S}\Big(t, \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) \vee \mathrm{S}\Big(t, \mu\big(\{g \geqslant t\}\big)\Big)\Big\} \\
&= \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t, \mu\big(\{f \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) \vee \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathrm{S}\Big(t, \mu\big(\{g \geqslant t\}\big)\Big) \\
&= \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}(\mu, f) \vee \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}(\mu, g).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. □

Problem 2 (Problem 2.32)**.** *Let* $\mathrm{S} \in \mathfrak{S}$ *be fixed. To describe all the commuting binary operators with the integral* $\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}$ *(under the condition of comonotonicity of functions* f, g*), i.e., to find all operators* $\circ\colon [0,1]^2 \to [0,1]$ *such that*

$$\mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}(\mu, f \circ g) = \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}(\mu, f) \circ \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{S}}(\mu, g) \tag{12}$$

for all $f, g\colon X \to [0,1]$ *comonotone functions.*

We give an answer to this problem for some class of operators $\circ$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let* $\mathrm{S} \in \mathfrak{S}$ *be fixed and let* $\circ$ *be either a semicopula or t-coseminorm. The equality* (12) *holds for all comonotone functions* $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_{(X,\mathcal{A})}$ *iff* $\circ = \vee$.

Proof. Put $f = \mathbb{1}_A = g$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}$. Thus $(f \circ g)(x)$ equals 1, if $x \in A$ and 0 otherwise, which implies that $\mu\big(\{f \circ g \geqslant t\}\big) = \mu(A)$ for $t \in (0,1]$ and $\mu\big(\{f \circ g \geqslant 0\}\big) = 1$. By (12)

$$\mu(A) = \mu(A) \circ \mu(A).$$

In consequence, we have $x = x \circ x$ for all x. If $\circ$ is a semicopula then $\circ = \wedge$. Indeed, if $x \leqslant y$, then

$$x = x \circ x \leqslant x \circ y \leqslant x \wedge y = x$$

so $x \circ y = x \wedge y$. Similar arguments apply to the case of $x > y$. Obviously, if $\circ$ is a t-coseminorm then $\circ = \vee$.

Now we show that if $\circ = \wedge$, then the equality (12) is not satisfied for all $\mathrm{S} \in \mathfrak{S}$. Suppose that $\mathrm{S} = \Pi$ and $X = \{a, b\}$ with $\mu(\{a\}) = 0.5$, $\mu(\{b\}) = \beta \in [0,1]$ and $\mu(X) = 1$. Furthermore, we assume that $f(a) = 1$, $f(b) = 0.4$, $g(a) = 0.8$ and $g(b) = 0.6$. The functions f, g are comonotone on X. An elementary algebra shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{I}_{\Pi}(\mu, f) &= 0.4 \vee (1 \cdot 0.5) = 0.5, \\
\mathbf{I}_{\Pi}(\mu, g) &= 0.6 \vee (0.8 \cdot 0.5) = 0.6, \\
\mathbf{I}_{\Pi}\big(\mu, (f \wedge g)\big) &= 0.4 \vee (0.8 \cdot 0.5) = 0.4,
\end{aligned}$$

so $\mathbf{I}_\Pi\big(\mu,(f\wedge g)\big) < \mathbf{I}_\Pi(\mu,f)\wedge\mathbf{I}_\Pi(\mu,g)$. The equality (12) holds for $\circ=\vee$, which is a consequence of Theorem 3.1. □

References

[1] B. Bassan, F. Spizzichino, Relations among univariate aging, bivariate aging and dependence for exchangeable lifetimes, J. Multivariate Analysis 93 (2005) 313–339.

[2] F. Durante, C. Sempi, Semicopulæ, Kybernetika 41 (2005) 315-328.

[3] F. Suárez García, P. Gil Álvarez, Two families of fuzzy integrals, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 18 (1986) 67-81.

[4] J. Borzová-Molnárová, L. Halčinová, O. Hutník, The smallest semicopula-based universal integrals I: properties and characterizations, Fuzzy Sets and Systems (2014) http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2014.09.0232014.

[5] E.P. Klement, R. Mesiar, E. Pap, Triangular norms, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2000.

[6] E.P. Klement, R. Mesiar, E. Pap, A universal integral as common frame for Choquet and Sugeno integral, IEEE Transactions Fuzzy Sets and Systems 18 (2010) 178-187.

[7] J. Łukasiewicz, O logice trójwartościowej (in Polish). Ruch filozoficzny (1920) 170–171. English translation: On three-valued logic, in L. Borkowski (ed.), Selected works by Jan Łukasiewicz, North–Holland, Amsterdam, (1970) 87–88.

[8] R. Mesiar, A. Stupňanová, Open problems from the 12th International Conference on Fuzzy Set Theory and Its Applications, Fuzzy Sets and Systems (2014) http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2014.07.012

[9] Y. Ouyang, R. Mesiar, On the Chebyshev type inequality for seminormed fuzzy integral, Applied Mathematics Letters 22 (2009) 1810-1815.

[10] N. Shilkret, Maxitive measure and integration, Indagationes Mathematicae 33 (1971) 109-116.

[11] M. Sugeno, Theory of Fuzzy Integrals and its Applications, Ph.D. Dissertation, Tokyo Institute of Technology, 1974.